TERPS USA RESEARCH · WHITE PAPER SERIES

Post-Harvest Cannabis Research Series • Paper 1

The DIY Decontamination Trap:

Why Uncalibrated Bud Washing is Destroying the Product It Was Meant to Save — and the Consumer It Was Meant to Protect

A scientific examination of why the cannabis industry's most common post-harvest cleaning methods are chemically ineffective, biologically incomplete, and commercially destructive — and what calibrated decontamination actually requires.

Author: Kenneth Fry • ORCID: 0009-0008-9883-6055

Affiliation: Terps USA Research, Denver, Colorado

Document ID: WP-2026-04 • Version: 1.1 • Issued: 2026-05-01

License: Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

Copyright: © 2026 Terps USA • doi: 10.5281/zenodo.[WP04]

Abstract

The cannabis industry's most widely practiced post-harvest decontamination method — washing freshly harvested flower in a solution of lemon juice, baking soda, and hydrogen peroxide — is chemically self-defeating, biologically incomplete, and commercially destructive. This white paper presents a two-part scientific argument. The first part demonstrates that the DIY wash fails the product: citric acid and sodium bicarbonate undergo immediate acid-base neutralization when combined, eliminating both their antimicrobial acidity and fungistatic alkalinity before contacting a single pathogen. The resulting solution provides less than a 3-log pathogen reduction — among the weakest of any tested household disinfectant. **Hydrogen peroxide presents a concentration dilemma. Lower concentrations may provide insufficient oxidative activity for meaningful pathogen reduction, while progressively higher concentrations increase the risk of oxidative damage to terpene chemistry and other phytochemicals**

responsible for product quality. The second part demonstrates that the DIY wash fails the consumer: mycotoxins produced by Aspergillus and Fusarium species are chemically stable compounds that survive washing, survive combustion in modified forms, and enter the lungs directly when cannabis is smoked — even when the active mold colony has been killed and the product has passed total yeast and mold compliance testing. A 2025 Arizona State University study found 16% mycotoxin prevalence in cannabis samples, with fusarenon-X levels reaching 500 to 1,700 ppb. The 3.6 million registered medical cannabis patients in the United States — many of whom are immunocompromised — represent the population most dependent on cannabis and most vulnerable to these contaminants. The paper concludes that prevention through standardized, calibrated, professionally formulated decontamination is the only intervention that addresses both failures simultaneously.

Keywords: bud washing, DIY decontamination, mycotoxins, Aspergillus, hydrogen peroxide terpene damage, lemon juice baking soda neutralization, cannabis consumer safety, medical cannabis contamination, trichome preservation, post-harvest decontamination, fusarenon-X, calibrated wash protocol

---

Contents

1. Introduction: The Problem with the Solution
2. What Is Actually on Unwashed Cannabis
    - 2.1 Surface Contaminants and Debris
    - 2.2 Pesticide Residues
    - 2.3 Fungal Pathogens: Aspergillus and Powdery Mildew
    - 2.4 The Medical Patient Population
3. The DIY Trap Part One — The Placebo Wash
    - 3.1 The Lemon Juice / Baking Soda Neutralization Problem
    - 3.2 Why the Bubbling Means Nothing
    - 3.3 Efficacy Data: Less Than 3-Log Reduction
4. The DIY Trap Part Two — The H_2O_2 Destruction Spectrum
    - 4.1 Below 1%: Insufficient Oxidative Burst
    - 4.2 Above 3%: Irreversible Terpene Oxidation
    - 4.3 The Post-Wash Mold Paradox
5. The Hidden Threat That Survives Every Wash
    - 5.1 Mycotoxins: Not Alive, Cannot Be Killed

- 5.2 The Compliance Gap: Passing TYMC, Failing Safety
- 5.3 The Inhalation Route

6. Addressing the Counterargument
7. The Calibration Imperative
8. Conclusion

References

Related Publications

About the Author / Disclosure

---

1. Introduction: The Problem with the Solution

Across cannabis cultivation forums, YouTube channels, and grower guides, a consensus has emerged around post-harvest bud washing as the solution to the industry's contamination problem. The standard protocol — three buckets, one containing lemon juice and baking soda, two containing clean water for rinsing — has been repeated so many times that it has acquired the status of established practice. Tens of thousands of cultivators follow it every harvest season. Many report that it works.

The problem is not that bud washing is a bad idea. The problem is that the specific chemistry of the most widely used DIY protocol is self-defeating. The lemon juice and baking soda that growers believe are killing pathogens are neutralizing each other before they reach the flower. The hydrogen peroxide that growers use as a more aggressive alternative is either too dilute to be effective or concentrated enough to destroy the terpene chemistry it was meant to protect. And neither approach addresses the threat that persists after even a successful mold kill: the mycotoxins that the mold already produced, which survive washing, survive testing, and survive combustion to enter the consumer's lungs directly.

This white paper does not argue against post-harvest decontamination. It argues against uncalibrated post-harvest decontamination — the kitchen chemistry approach that gives cultivators the confidence of having done something protective without delivering the protection they believe they have purchased. The distinction matters most to the 3.6 million registered medical cannabis patients in the United States whose health depends on the answer to a question most of them have never thought to ask: did the person who grew this actually clean it correctly?

3.6M+ registered medical cannabis patients in the U.S. | **16%** of cannabis samples contain detectable mycotoxins (ASU, 2025) | **89%** of cannabis-linked fungal infections via smoking

(Frontiers, 2023) | **<3-log** pathogen reduction from baking soda — weakest of all tested disinfectants

---

2. What Is Actually on Unwashed Cannabis

Before evaluating the methods growers use to clean their harvest, it is necessary to establish what they are cleaning it from. The surface contamination profile of cannabis flower is more complex and more dangerous than most cultivators recognize.

2.1 Surface Contaminants and Debris

Cannabis trichomes are extraordinarily sticky by design — they evolved to trap insects and collect pollen. That same stickiness makes harvested flower a collection surface for everything present in the grow environment: dust, particulate matter, insect frass, hair, pollen from other plants, and microscopic debris from every surface the plant has been near during its life cycle. Indoor grows are not sterile environments. Outdoor grows are significantly more exposed. Even in controlled commercial facilities, every harvesting activity by workers introduces new contamination vectors — a peer-reviewed study found that harvesting activity itself was a statistically significant variable in total yeast and mold levels measured in dried inflorescences.

2.2 Pesticide Residues

The pesticide contamination problem in commercial cannabis is documented, current, and largely invisible to consumers. A April 2026 University of Washington and Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Board commentary in Clinical Therapeutics found that over half of California's available smoking products contain hidden pesticides — chemicals not monitored or regulated by state authorities because the EPA cannot set inhalation tolerance limits for cannabis under federal Schedule I status. The regulatory gap is structural: the federal agency responsible for pesticide safety assessment literally lacks the legal authority to evaluate what consumers are inhaling.

The health implications of this gap are not theoretical. Myclobutanil, a common fungicide applied to cannabis crops, releases hydrogen cyanide when combusted at temperatures reached during smoking. In 2023, California's Department of Cannabis Control tested over 3,250 samples and found 13% failed due to pesticide residues above legal limits — and those limits themselves do not account for the chemical transformation that occurs when pesticide residues are subjected to combustion.

2.3 Fungal Pathogens: Aspergillus and Powdery Mildew

Aspergillus is a genus of over 300 mold species, several of which are pathogenic to humans. The species most commonly identified in cannabis — Aspergillus fumigatus, Aspergillus flavus, Aspergillus niger, and Aspergillus terreus — are opportunistic pathogens capable of causing invasive pulmonary aspergillosis in vulnerable individuals. Powdery mildew, caused by Gonosporium spp. and related organisms, produces conidia that remain viable on dried flower and are inhaled directly during smoking. Both contaminants are endemic in cannabis cultivation environments and both survive conventional drying and curing processes.

The cannabis mycobiome — the full community of fungi associated with cannabis plants — comprises over 100 species. Research published in Frontiers in Microbiology identified this mycobiome as historically understudied in cannabis safety research, with most regulatory attention focused on a narrow subset of the actual fungal diversity present on commercial cannabis products.

2.4 The Medical Patient Population

The contamination risks described above are not equally distributed across the consumer population. Medical cannabis patients — those using cannabis to manage cancer, HIV/AIDS, autoimmune disorders, organ transplant recovery, and chemotherapy side effects — are simultaneously the consumers most dependent on cannabis and the most physiologically vulnerable to its contaminants.

There are over 3.6 million registered medical cannabis patients in the United States, representing 8.3% of the population in Oklahoma, 3.8% in Florida, and 3.3% in Pennsylvania. These figures significantly undercount the real total because California and several other large states do not maintain mandatory medical cannabis registries. Among this population, kidney transplant patients using cannabis showed aspiration pneumonia rates of 4.3% versus 1.1% in non-users. The Canadian Cardiovascular Society has issued a strong recommendation for six-month cannabis abstinence before heart transplant specifically due to contamination risk. COVID-19 patients — who are immunocompromised — show 20 to 30% Aspergillosis rates.

> *The patients who need cannabis most are the patients most at risk from contaminated cannabis.*

Post-harvest decontamination is not a quality preference for this population. It is a health necessity.

---

3. The DIY Trap Part One — The Placebo Wash

The most widely recommended DIY bud wash combines lemon juice and baking soda in water. Growers who use this method report satisfying results: the solution bubbles

vigorously, the rinse water turns brown with removed debris, and the dried flower looks and smells cleaner. The method has been validated by years of positive anecdotal experience in grower communities. There is one significant problem: the chemistry does not work the way growers believe it does.

3.1 The Lemon Juice / Baking Soda Neutralization Problem

Lemon juice is effective against some surface pathogens because of its acidity — citric acid at a pH of approximately 2 to 3 creates an environment hostile to many bacterial and fungal organisms. Baking soda (sodium bicarbonate) has mild fungistatic properties at alkaline pH, inhibiting the growth of some fungal species. Both properties are real. The problem is what happens when they are combined.

When citric acid (lemon juice) and sodium bicarbonate (baking soda) are mixed in water, they undergo an immediate and complete acid-base neutralization reaction. The chemical equation is straightforward:

$C_6H_8O_7 + 3\ NaHCO_3 \rightarrow Na_3C_6H_5O_7 + 3\ H_2O + 3\ CO_2$

Citric acid + Sodium bicarbonate → Sodium citrate + Water + Carbon dioxide

The acidity of the lemon juice and the alkalinity of the baking soda cancel each other completely.

What remains is primarily a sodium citrate solution containing dissolved carbon dioxide, with substantially reduced acidity and alkalinity compared with the original ingredients.

The neutralization is not gradual — it occurs immediately upon mixing. By the time a grower submerges their harvested flower in the solution, neither the antimicrobial acidity of the lemon juice nor the fungistatic alkalinity of the baking soda is present in any meaningful concentration. Both active properties have been chemically consumed in the neutralization reaction.

3.2 Why the Bubbling Means Nothing

The vigorous bubbling that growers observe when combining lemon juice and baking soda — and that makes the wash feel active and effective — is the carbon dioxide produced by the neutralization reaction escaping the solution. It is the chemical signature of the antimicrobial properties being destroyed, not the antimicrobial properties being deployed. The more vigorously the solution bubbles, the more completely the acid-base neutralization has occurred.

This finding was independently identified by a grower on THCFarmer who recognized the basic chemistry and posted it as a "glaring problem" with the standard wash recipe. It has never been formally documented in a cannabis research context. The mechanical action of

the wash — the physical agitation of submerging and swirling branches — does remove visible debris, dust, and surface particulate matter. That is a real benefit. But the pathogen reduction effect that most growers believe they are achieving from the chemical properties of the solution does not exist.

3.3 Efficacy Data: Less Than 3-Log Pathogen Reduction

Peer-reviewed evaluation of household disinfectants confirms the limited efficacy of baking soda-based solutions against common pathogens. Research published in Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology found that baking soda solutions achieve less than a 3-log reduction against common pathogens — meaning less than 99.9% kill rate — making it one of the least effective of all tested disinfectant substances. For context, hospital-grade disinfectants targeting Aspergillus achieve 5-log to 6-log reductions.

The DIY lemon juice / baking soda wash removes visible dirt. It does not meaningfully reduce Aspergillus spore loads, powdery mildew conidia, or bacterial contamination. The grower who uses it believes they have decontaminated their harvest. They have washed it.

---

4. The DIY Trap Part Two — The H_2O_2 Destruction Spectrum

Growers who recognize the limitations of the lemon juice and baking soda approach frequently turn to hydrogen peroxide (H_2O_2) as a more powerful alternative. Hydrogen peroxide is a genuine oxidizing agent with documented antimicrobial properties. Unlike the neutralized lemon juice and baking soda solution, it does produce a real oxidative burst capable of penetrating pathogen cell walls. The problem is that its effective antimicrobial concentration range and its safe phytochemical concentration range do not overlap.

> **The concentration ranges discussed below represent conceptual risk zones synthesized from the cited literature. They are intended to illustrate the practical trade-offs encountered in uncalibrated DIY applications and should not be interpreted as universally validated efficacy thresholds.**

4.1 Below 1%: Insufficient Oxidative Burst

At concentrations below 1% — the range most commonly recommended in grower forums as "safe" for flower — hydrogen peroxide does not generate sufficient oxidative activity to penetrate the cell walls of Aspergillus spores or powdery mildew conidia. The tough, melanized cell walls of Aspergillus fumigatus in particular are specifically adapted to resist oxidative stress. A sub-1% H_2O_2 wash provides minimal pathogen reduction against the organisms most likely to be present on contaminated cannabis.

4.2 Above 3%: Irreversible Terpene Oxidation

At concentrations above 3%, hydrogen peroxide begins to oxidize the terpene molecules that constitute the commercial and pharmacological value of the flower. Terpenes are unsaturated hydrocarbons — they contain double bonds that are chemically vulnerable to attack by the reactive oxygen species generated by hydrogen peroxide. The oxidation is irreversible: once a terpene molecule's double bond has been broken by oxidative attack, no subsequent drying or curing process restores it.

The specific consequences for individual terpenes are documented and commercially significant. Limonene, one of the most prevalent and commercially valuable monoterpenes in cannabis, oxidizes into limonene oxide — a compound with a distinctly different aroma profile and potential to irritate mucous membranes. Beta-pinene loses approximately 25% of its concentration under moderate UV oxidative stress conditions. Alpha-pinene shows significant time-dependent degradation. These losses are not cosmetic — they directly reduce the terpene profile that determines the flower's strain identity, consumer experience, and market price.

The quantified impact on cannabinoid content is equally significant. A peer-reviewed study published in Cannabis and Cannabinoid Research used hydrogen peroxide as an accelerated oxidation agent and found that inflorescence stored under uncontrolled oxidative conditions experienced 34.3% total THC degradation over 127 days, compared to 18.0% in samples protected by terpene antioxidants — a 47% difference in cannabinoid preservation attributable directly to oxidative protection.

Table 1. Conceptual concentration ranges illustrating the practical trade-off between antimicrobial activity and phytochemical preservation in uncalibrated DIY bud washing.

H_2O_2 Concentration	Pathogen Reduction	Phytochemical Impact
Below 0.5%	Negligible — insufficient oxidative burst	Minimal direct damage; physical agitation only
0.5% – 1%	Marginal — inadequate for Aspergillus spores	Low risk to terpenes; low efficacy
1% – 3%	Moderate — variable by pathogen type	Risk of terpene oxidation begins; threshold zone
Above 3%	Higher — but irrelevant if product is destroyed	Irreversible terpene oxidation; THC degradation begins
Above 6%	Strong antimicrobial — unsuitable for flower	Severe terpene and cannabinoid destruction; bud burn

4.3 The Post-Wash Mold Paradox

Even when a grower executes a wash that achieves some degree of pathogen reduction, the post-harvest decontamination process introduces a new biological risk: rehydration. Dense cannabis flower retains moisture in its internal structure significantly longer than its surface suggests. A bud that feels dry to the touch within 24 hours of washing may retain internal moisture content above the 0.65 to 0.70 water activity threshold at which microbial activity is suppressed for several additional days.

Forum documentation from THCFarmer records a grower who executed a standard DIY bud wash following outdoor harvest, maintained appropriate temperature and humidity conditions during drying, and lost the entire 2-pound harvest to mold within five days. Post-wash inspection revealed that internal moisture had created micro-pockets of high humidity within the dense flower structure — precisely the conditions in which Botrytis cinerea and Aspergillus thrive. The wash had removed surface contamination. The rehydration had created new internal contamination conditions that the grower's drying protocol could not resolve quickly enough.

> *The DIY trap runs in both directions. The wash can fail to kill the pathogens it targets. The wash can succeed in removing surface contamination while introducing the moisture conditions that allow new contamination to develop internally during drying.*

---

5. The Hidden Threat That Survives Every Wash

5.1 Mycotoxins: Not Alive, Cannot Be Killed

The most consequential limitation of any bud washing protocol — DIY or professional — is one that is almost never discussed in grower communities: washing addresses living organisms. It does not address the toxic compounds those organisms have already produced.

Mycotoxins are secondary metabolites — chemical byproducts produced by fungi as part of their biological activity. The species most relevant to cannabis, Aspergillus flavus and Aspergillus parasiticus, produce aflatoxins. Aspergillus ochraceus produces ochratoxin A. Fusarium species produce fusarenon-X and diacetoxyscirpenol. These compounds are not organisms — they are stable chemical molecules. They do not die because they are not alive. An oxidative wash that successfully kills every active Aspergillus spore on a contaminated flower does not affect the aflatoxin molecules already deposited on and within that flower. **Many mycotoxins may persist through washing, drying, and curing,**

while combustion may transform them into different degradation products rather than reliably eliminating them.

5.2 The Compliance Gap: Passing TYMC, Failing Safety

The regulatory testing framework for microbial contamination in most U.S. cannabis markets is built around total yeast and mold count (TYMC) testing. A product passes TYMC testing if the colony-forming unit count per gram falls below the state's threshold. What TYMC testing measures is the population of viable, living fungal organisms. What it does not measure is the mycotoxin load that a prior fungal infection left behind.

This creates a compliance gap with direct consumer health implications. A cultivator who treats a visible Aspergillus infection — whether with a DIY wash or any other intervention — may successfully reduce the viable spore count below the TYMC threshold. The product passes compliance testing. It reaches retail. The consumer purchases it believing it is safe. The aflatoxins, ochratoxins, and fusarenon-X molecules produced during the active infection are present in every gram.

A 2025 Arizona State University study tested 118 seized cannabis samples from Arizona and California and found that 16% contained detectable mycotoxins. Some samples contained fusarenon-X at concentrations of 500 to 1,700 parts per billion — levels that vastly exceed agricultural safety thresholds established for food products. One sample contained diacetoxyscirpenol, a compound classified by the U.S. government as a federally designated biological select agent due to its potential for weaponization.

16% of tested cannabis samples contained detectable mycotoxins (ASU, 2025) | **1,700 ppb** peak fusarenon-X concentration found — exceeds ag safety thresholds | **0** mycotoxins destroyed by washing — they are chemicals, not organisms | **100%** of mycotoxins survive TYMC compliance testing designed to detect live mold

5.3 The Inhalation Route

The route of consumption matters enormously for mycotoxin exposure. Mycotoxins ingested through food pass through the digestive system, where they are subject to metabolic processing by the liver before reaching systemic circulation. Mycotoxins inhaled through cannabis smoke bypass the digestive system entirely and enter the bloodstream directly through the lung tissue. The bioavailability of inhaled mycotoxins is significantly higher than ingested mycotoxins for the same exposure level. A review published in Frontiers in Microbiology found that 89% of documented fungal infections linked to cannabis use occurred through smoking the flower — confirming that inhalation is the dominant route of harm.

> *A product can pass every required compliance test and still deliver mycotoxins directly to the lungs. TYMC testing measures living organisms. Mycotoxins are not organisms. They*

> *are invisible to the primary safety test most states require.*

6. Addressing the Counterargument

In July 2025, MJBizDaily published a contributed column arguing that mold in cannabis is not a significant public health risk, that Aspergillosis from cannabis is extremely rare, and that known cases of harm are literally one in millions. The column cited years of legalization data showing no documented epidemic of cannabis-induced Aspergillosis in legal markets.

This counterargument deserves a direct response because it is partially correct and significantly incomplete. It is correct that invasive pulmonary Aspergillosis in immunocompetent cannabis users is rare. It is incomplete in three important ways.

First, the CDC published a study finding that cannabis users are 3.5 times more likely to acquire a fungal infection than non-users — and this included documented cases of Aspergillosis in immunocompetent patients. Rare is not zero. Second, the argument focuses on a single pathogen outcome (invasive Aspergillosis) while ignoring the broader contamination picture: pesticide residues including myclobutanil releasing hydrogen cyanide during combustion, mycotoxin loads that are invisible to TYMC compliance testing, and the 54% of American consumers who believe their legal cannabis contains pesticides. Third, and most significantly, the argument is made from population-level data that averages across all users — including the immunocompetent majority. For the immunocompromised minority who represent a substantial portion of the medical cannabis market, the risk profile is categorically different. The rare population-level event is a common individual-level risk for a chemotherapy patient, an organ transplant recipient, or an HIV-positive consumer.

> *The counterargument that Aspergillosis is rare is a population-level statement. For the 3.6 million medical cannabis patients — many of whom are immunocompromised — it is not a population-level risk. It is a personal one.*

7. The Calibration Imperative

The scientific problems documented in this paper — the acid-base neutralization of lemon juice and baking soda, the H_2O_2 concentration dilemma, the post-wash mold paradox, and the mycotoxin persistence gap — are not arguments against bud washing. They are arguments against uncalibrated bud washing. Each problem has a technical solution. The collective solution is calibration.

A calibrated post-harvest decontamination protocol addresses the neutralization problem by using active ingredients that do not cancel each other upon contact. It addresses the

H_2O_2 concentration dilemma by using a precisely engineered oxidative formula that delivers effective pathogen reduction within a concentration range that does not trigger terpene oxidation. It addresses the post-wash mold paradox through formulation design that accounts for post-wash drying kinetics. It addresses the mycotoxin gap by treating mycotoxin prevention — keeping microbial loads below the threshold at which mycotoxin production occurs — as the primary objective rather than a secondary consideration.

Table 2. DIY decontamination failure modes and calibrated solutions.

DIY Problem	Why It Occurs	Calibrated Solution
Lemon juice / baking soda placebo	Acid-base neutralization destroys active properties on contact	Formulation uses non-conflicting active ingredients
H_2O_2 below effective threshold	Safe DIY concentrations insufficient for Aspergillus spore walls	Calibrated oxidative burst at engineered concentration
H_2O_2 above safe threshold	Terpene oxidation and THC degradation at higher concentrations	Formulation optimized within phytochemical safety window
Post-wash mold from rehydration	Dense flower retains internal moisture above fungal growth threshold	Protocol design accounts for post-wash drying kinetics
Mycotoxin persistence	Mycotoxins are chemicals, not organisms — no wash kills them	Prevention focus: keep microbial load below mycotoxin-producing threshold

---

8. Conclusion

The DIY decontamination trap has two jaws. The first closes on the product: the most widely used bud wash recipe is a placebo, and the most widely used active ingredient is calibrated by neither the cultivator nor the protocol. The grower who uses a lemon juice and baking soda wash believes they have deployed antimicrobial chemistry against their contamination problem. **They have largely neutralized the intended chemical activity of the wash while removing visible surface debris from the flower.** The grower who uses hydrogen peroxide without precise concentration control is navigating blind between a concentration too low to work and a concentration too high to be safe — and most of them land somewhere in the middle, achieving partial pathogen reduction while partially destroying the terpene profile that makes their product worth selling.

The second jaw closes on the consumer. Mycotoxins produced by prior fungal activity survive every wash, pass through TYMC compliance testing undetected, survive combustion in modified forms, and enter the lungs of consumers who have every reason to believe they purchased a safe, tested, legal product. The 3.6 million registered medical cannabis patients in the United States — the population that relies most heavily on cannabis and suffers the consequences of contamination most severely — are the people most exposed to this gap between what compliance testing measures and what is actually present in the product.

The solution is not to stop washing. The solution is to wash correctly — with a calibrated, professionally formulated protocol that delivers the pathogen reduction the grower needs, within the phytochemical safety window the product requires, with a mycotoxin prevention strategy built into the decontamination objective from the start. The difference between a placebo wash and a calibrated protocol is the difference between the confidence of having done something and the assurance of having done it right.

An uncalibrated DIY wash should not be assumed to have effectively decontaminated the harvest. It has introduced the uncertainty of partial treatment — which may be more dangerous than no treatment at all, because it eliminates the vigilance that visible contamination would trigger.

Version 1.1 of this paper will address emerging mycotoxin-specific testing frameworks and their implications for cannabis compliance standards.

References

[1] Zumdahl, S.S. & Zumdahl, S.A. (2013). Chemistry (9th ed.). Cengage Learning.

[2] Rutala, W.A., et al. (2000). Antimicrobial activity of home disinfectants and natural products against potential human pathogens. Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology, 21(1), 33–38.

[3] Encore Labs. (2025). Mycotoxins in cannabis: The importance of testing.

[4] Arizona State University. (2025, March 20). New study reveals high levels of toxins in seized cannabis from Arizona and California. ASU News.

[5] Gwinn, K.D., et al. (2023). Fungal and mycotoxin contaminants in cannabis and hemp flowers: implications for consumer health and directions for further research. Frontiers in Microbiology.

[6] Marijuana Policy Project. (2024). Medical marijuana patient numbers.

[7] National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2017). The Health Effects of Cannabis and Cannabinoids. National Academies Press.

[8] Bueno, J., et al. (2022). Vapor phase terpenes mitigate oxidative degradation of Cannabis sativa inflorescence cannabinoid content in an accelerated stability study. Cannabis and

Cannabinoid Research.
[9] Raeber, et al. (2025). Comprehensive analysis of chemical and enantiomeric stability of terpenes in Cannabis sativa L. flowers. Phytochemical Analysis.
[10] Encore Labs. (2025). Terpene degradation in cannabis.
[11] Beyond Pesticides. (2026, April 1). Pick your poison: Pesticide contamination in cannabis reveals longstanding gaps in FIFRA.
[12] California Department of Cannabis Control. (2023). DCC compliance testing data.
[13] Medicinal Genomics. (2023). Aspergillus: The most dangerous cannabis pathogen.
[14] Smith, D. (2024). Understanding Aspergillus contamination in cannabis flowers and the risks to immunocompromised individuals. Cannabis Science and Technology, 7(6), 24–30.
[15] Punja, Z.K., et al. (2023). Total yeast and mold levels in high THC-containing cannabis inflorescences are influenced by genotype, environment, and pre- and post-harvest handling practices. PMC.
[16] THCFarmer Community Forums. (2021). How to prevent mold in drying room.
[17] Parzybok, E. (2025, July 25). Mold in cannabis is not a 'significant public health risk.' MJBizDaily.

Related Publications

Terps USA Research Program

Botanical Terpene Research Series

- WP-2026-01 — Botanical Terpene Enhancement in Cannabis Flower
- WP-2026-02 — The Transparency Standard
- WP-2026-03 — PG, PEG and Botanical Terpenes

Post-Harvest Cannabis Research Series

- **Paper 1 — The DIY Decontamination Trap (Current)**

About the Author & Disclosure

Kenneth Fry is the founder of Terps USA, a Denver, Colorado-based company specializing in cannabis terpene science, post-harvest product formulation, and cultivation chemistry. This white paper is part of the Terps USA Research white paper series, published under permanent DOI on Zenodo.org with open access under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license. ORCID: 0009-0008-9883-6055.

Disclosure: The author is affiliated with Terps USA, which develops and markets post-harvest decontamination products for commercial cannabis cultivation. This paper

presents documented scientific data and peer-reviewed research. Readers are encouraged to independently verify all cited sources. Commercial applications of the findings discussed in this paper are available at TerpsUSA.com.

WP-2026-04 • © 2026 Terps USA • CC BY 4.0 • Published via Zenodo.org • Part of the Terps USA Research White Paper Series